



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/776,841

02/11/2004

Patrick J. Helland

MS 306777.01

3027

47973 7590 11/10/2009
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2454

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/10/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 17-25 and 29 are presented for the examination. Claims 1-16, 26-28 and 30 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 17-25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurille et al. (6,484,196) (Hereinafter Maurille) in view of Yeager et al. (7,213,047) (Hereinafter Yeager).

4. As per claim 17, Maurille discloses a method that facilitates message processing, the method performed within a computer comprising one or more processors and computer system memory, the method comprising:

requesting one or more messages (issuing query in the message table, col 9, lines 29-31).

determining (upon receiving the message, col 10, lines 18-20) from information associated (relational database maintains the association, 108, fig 1, col 6, lines 44-57)

Art Unit: 2454

with the one or more message that each of the one or more message belongs to a conversation group (conference [conversation], Fig 7C and 108, fig 1, col 6, lines 44-57);

linking (updating message table and other related tables, col 10, lines 31-35) the one or more messages by a group identifier (the process of linking includes updating relation in the related tables, 108, Fig 3A, col 10, lines 5-67);

locking the conversation group ("locking (conversation history plus agreement capabilities)" col 2, lines 65-67).

Maurille did not specifically disclose the lock preventing a disparate requestor from accessing the one or more messages; and providing exclusive serial access to the messages. However, Yeager discloses the lock preventing ("limit access", col 28, line 52) a disparate requestor from accessing (it is known in the relational database art, database lock Locking is a mechanism by which database systems can prevent conflicting access to data when multiple users are making requests to the data.) the one or more messages (1813, Fig 25, col 28, lines 47-48) ; and providing exclusive serial access to the messages (serialized java object, col 68, line 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yeager and Maurille. All the claimed elements (serialized object and preventing access by locking records) were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art would have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

5. As per claim 18, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17, above. In addition, Maurille discloses receiving one or more related messages (issuing query in the message table, col 9, lines 29-31) associating the related messages with the conversation group (the process of associating includes updating relation in the related tables, 108, Fig 3A, col 10, lines 5-67).

6. As per claim 19, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17, above. In addition, Maurille discloses automatically updating the conversation group (144, fig 2) with incoming related messages (col 10, lines 30-35).

7. As per claim 20, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17, above. In addition, Maurille discloses utilizing a conversation group identifier (272, fig 2) to lock the conversation group ("locking (conversation history plus agreement capabilities)" col 2, lines 65-67, col 10, lines 18-67, updating requires locking the records).

8. As per claim 21, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17, above. In addition, Maurille discloses storing the message in-order (142, fig 5B, message record M001 –M006)

9. As per claim 22, Maurille discloses a method that facilitates message processing, the method performed within a computer comprising on or more processors and computer system memory, the method comprising:

receives a request for a message (issuing query in the message table, col 9, lines 29-31);

Determining (upon receiving the message, col 10, lines 18-20) from information associated (relational database maintains the association, 108, fig 1, col 6, lines 44-57) with the message that message belongs to a conversation group (conference [conversation], Fig 7C and 108, fig 1, col 6, lines 44-57);

associating (updating message table and other related tables, col 10, lines 31-35) the messages and other related messages with a conversation group (the process of linking includes updating relation in the related tables, 108, Fig 3A, col 10, lines 5-67);

Locking the conversation group ("locking (conversation history plus agreement capabilities)" col 2, lines 65-67) via a conversation group identifier (conference ID 144, Fig 2, the conference Id must be used to lock).

Maurille did not specifically disclose providing exclusive access to one or more messages of the conversation group to the requestor. However, Yeager discloses the providing exclusive access to one or more messages of the conversation group to the requestor (it is known in the relational database art, database lock Locking is a mechanism by which database systems can prevent conflicting access to data when multiple users are making requests to the data, the one or more messages (1813, Fig 25, col 28, lines 47-48, col 68, line 24; serialized java object). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yeager and Maurille. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by

Art Unit: 2454

known methods with no change in their respective functions and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

10. As per claim 23, claims is rejected for the same reasons as claims 22, above. In addition, Maurille discloses utilizing message identifiers (M001, M002, Fig 3B, col 10, lines 25-40) to determine whether messages are related (M001, M002, Fig 3B, col 10, lines 25-40, same record owner).

11. As per claim 24, claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22, above. In addition, Maurille discloses receiving the conversation group identifiers to associate with the conversation group (142, fig 3B, col 10, lines 18-67).

12. As per claim 25, claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22, above. In addition, Maurille discloses dynamically updating conversation group with incoming related messages (142, fig 3B, col 10, lines 25-40).

13. As per claim 29, claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17, above. In addition, Maurille discloses a computer readable medium storing computer executable instructions which when executed upon one or more computer processors facilitate processing by causing the processors to perform the method of claim 17 (elements of fig 1).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-25 and 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MOHAMMAD A. SIDDIQI whose telephone number is (571)272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

Art Unit: 2454

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MS

**/NATHAN FLYNN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454**